Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

pi'el, niph'al and hithpa'el which, in case the original verb still exists, can only be brought in connection with it in a forced manner. The author finds it necessary to resort to etymologies which will probably not be accepted by every reader. Thus the argument remains largely subjective. Of grammatical observations made by the author we may mention the following: It cannot be said that certain nominal formations place their denominatives preferably in one particular stem. There are not many derivatives from nouns of place or time, but they occur regularly in the causative. For the same category of concepts the same stem will be used. The oldest denominatives were formed in the simple stem. The material used for the purpose of proving the points mentioned above is arranged in the form of a lexicon which goes minutely into the ramified usage of a verb in the present literature and embodies the results of a painstaking and independent exegetical study of the biblical texts. The book is a useful supplement to any Hebrew lexicon.

MAX L. MARGOLIS.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE PROPHETS COMMONLY CALLED THE MINOR PROPHETS. By GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. Vol. I. Amos, Hosea, and Micah, with an introduction and a sketch of prophecy in early Israel. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Co. Pp. xvii + 440. $2.

NOTHING could have been more satisfactory than the selection of George Adam Smith to furnish the volumes on the Minor Prophets in the series of the *Expositor's Bible*. These books, which have been "haunted for centuries by a peddling and an ambiguous title," deserve the attention, not only of an accurate scholar, but also of a sympathetic spirit. Both of these are combined in Professor Smith. The causes for the almost universal neglect of the minor prophets by the church are, in his words, "the more than usual corrupt state of the text; the consequent disorder and in parts unintelligibleness of all the versions; the ignorance of the various historical circumstances out of which the books arose; the absence of successful efforts to determine the periods and strophes, the dramatic dialogues (with the names of the speakers), the lyric effusions and the passages of argument, of all of which the

books are composed." The plan of the volume includes a historical sketch of prophecy down to the time of Amos; then each prophet is taken up in chronological order, and, in connection with each, a critical introduction to the book, an account of the prophet himself, and a translation of the various prophecies with an application to the present. In each case there follows a summary of the main doctrines taught by the prophet.

One of the best chapters of the book is that on "The Influence of Assyria upon Prophecy." This gives the reader the real situation in Israel before Assyria had accomplished the worst, and explains why, when the prophets were assured of Israel's overthrow, the leaders of the people were so indifferent about Assyria's coming. A study of Assyria's movements from 870 B. C. when Assurnasirpal took tribute from Tyre and Sidon to 721, when Samaria fell, shows, according to Professor Smith, that, after all, Assyria's advance was "fitful and irregular," and her sieges of the western cities "prolonged and doubtful." In many cases it requires the campaigns of several years to accomplish their purpose. It was always possible politically that Assyria would not come back, and at times when she was engaged in putting down revolts in other parts of her empire a combination of forces in Syria might have been successful. The only explanation of the vagueness of Amos' descriptions of Assyria is the political uncertainty of the future; and if the prophet himself is uncertain, how easy to understand the uncertainty felt by the leaders. There was always the chance of the recall of the Assyrian army because of the uprising of distant provinces. There were all the difficulties of carrying on war in the mountainous regions of Palestine. The case, in other words, was not a hopeless case; there was a chance, down to the very end, of success. Besides all this, Israel's new conception of God had aroused the nation. Their God was supreme. How could he surrender his nation to a heathen people? The leaders of Israel and the people were optimists. In opposition, however, stood the prophets. And the better we appreciate the side of the leaders, the better able we shall be to understand the independence of the prophets who, from the beginning, predicted the fall of Israel by Assyria. This conviction, as is clearly pointed out, rested upon their belief in the righteousness of Jehovah.

We cannot accept Professor Smith's statement that Assyria's advance on Israel is nowhere treated as a problem. Isaiah, at a certain stage in his career, had no use for Assyria in the plan of his work; and Habakkuk,

later, was almost hopelessly paralyzed by the problem presented by the Babylonians. The proposition that the spiritual service which Assyria rendered could not have been performed without the conviction of righteousness on the part of the prophets is of course true. Israel's compact with Assyria required a complete reconstruction of her theology. A new conception of God and of his power resulted. The prophets, indeed, were raised up to bring about this new adjustment in the situation. Assyria's work of breaking up the kingdoms of the earth and uniting them in one great empire was the basis for new conceptions of the sovereign providence. The breaking up of tribes was the breaking up of the tribal theory of religion, that is, a god for every tribe. The doctrine of monotheism therefore had an opportunity for development which never before existed. Israel's imagination and sympathy were wonderfully widened in this period of Assyria's conquest. It is in this connection also, as the writer continues to show, that Israel first learned the doctrine of equality of all men; a lesson gained from the falling of nation after nation before the Assyrian power. Professor Smith's suggestion that the influence also extended to Israel's conception of God in nature is less definite and concrete, and his illustration in which he finds a deeper meaning in the old national name Jehovah of Hosts does not commend itself.

The division of the Book of Amos into three sections, namely, chaps. 1 and 2, The Heathen's Crimes and Israel's; chaps. 3–6, Israel's Crime and Doom; chaps. 7–9, Divisions with Interludes, seems to have no real basis in the facts. The book is rather composed of a series of independent poems, not closely connected, each poem representing an oracle, the various oracles repeating over and over again the same thoughts. The more minute division of chaps. 3–6 into six groups, closing with 3:15; 4:3; 4:12; 5:17; 5:27; 6:14, we think could be improved by substituting 3:1–8; 3:9—4:3; 4:4—12 (13), etc. Surely 3:9—4:3 is a piece by itself made up of six strophes, each of four pentameters. In this piece, much is gained by transferring 3:15 to follow 3:11. The strophes in 4:1–3, directed against women and describing the siege of the capital, is the climax of what goes before and should be closely connected with the preceding.[1] Just such a climax is given us by Isaiah in the important section beginning with chap. 2:6 and closing with the diatribe against women in 3:16—4:1.

The exact time of Amos' writing is represented as during the later

[1] So Wellhausen.

years of Jeroboam's reign, after the pestilence and the eclipse (about 763), and before the advance of Tiglathpileser in 743. His argument (p. 69) for the genuineness of the title is not conclusive.

The description of the surroundings of Amos (pp. 79–81), and the various ways in which he might have secured the large knowledge which his book exhibits, is an excellent example of the author's skill in picturing the background of an utterance.

In his interpretation of Amos 3:1–8, he follows closely the ordinary view which makes the passage an explanation of the prophet's mission, upon the ground that he is compelled to speak although against his will.[2] The thought is rather: Israel, who has forsaken Jehovah, shall be punished, for there must be agreement between a nation and its God (vss. 1–3). The prophet sees ahead the dissolution of the covenant relationship; the *two* are Israel and God, not God and the prophet (so Grotius, Gebhard, Marck, Harenberg, Justi, Schröder, Henderson, Pusey). The roar of the enemy may even now be heard; Israel, though unconscious of the fact, is already within the toils; only the prophet sees and hears (vss. 4, 5); the calamity comes from Jehovah; but Jehovah always warns; why, then, do not the people tremble (vss. 6, 7)? The enemy having manifested his presence, everyone should fear (and repent); Jehovah having spoken (in the clearest possible tones), everyone should be able to prophesy, that is, recognize the coming calamity (vs. 8). The prophet sees it, why does not everyone see it?

The treatment is ostensibly a popular one; and yet the book abounds in critical observations. The most important of them are found in footnotes, *e. g.*, p. 57 on יהוה צבאות, in which he understands that "hosts" is always used of human beings; p. 77, on the sycamore; p. 126, on destruction of Gath, as against Wellhausen; p. 139, on עוק (2:13); p. 146, on בדמשק ערש (3:12); pp. 205, 206, on the titles for God in Amos; p. 261, on גאון; p. 315, on the emendation of Hos. 14:8. It is worthy of note that in this particular the author gives very much less attention to Hosea and Micah than to Amos.

In his treatment of the text, Professor Smith is very liberal, throwing out as of later date in Amos not 1:9, 10 (Tyre), nor, probably, 1:

[2] So Calvin (1557), Mercer (1675), Dathe (1773), Vater (1810), Rosenmüller (1812), Hitzig (1838), Ewald (1840), Henderson (1845), Baur (1847), Pusey (1860), Keil (1866), Hoffmann (1883), Gunning (1885), Reuss (1892), Wellhausen (1892), Mitchell (1893). This list is merely representative.

11, 12 (Edom), but surely 2 : 4, 5 (Judah), agreeing here with Duhm and Wellhausen, as against Robertson Smith and Kuenen. He would omit also 4 : 13; 5 : 8, 9; 9 : 5, 6. More important still, he rejects 9 : 8–15. Still other less important omissions are advocated.

In Hosea he treats as glosses 4 : 15 (?); 6 : 11—7 : 11 (?); 7 : 4; 8 : 2; 12 : 6. Of the twelve references to Judah in Hosea he rejects 4 : 15; 8 : 14; 5 : 5; 6 : 10, 11. He maintains against Cornill the genuineness of 10 : 11, and against Wellhausen that of 12 : 3.

Professor Smith's exposition is particularly happy in the following passages: the situation of Hosea (pp. 253, 254; his characterization of Hosea's description of the phases of Israel's might (p. 254). The chapters on Hosea's knowledge of God, Repentance, Sin against love are summaries of the theology of the book, and, as such, unsurpassed.

As much cannot be said of the treatment accorded Micah. With 140 pp. for Amos, nearly 150 for Hosea, and only 80 for Micah, as much could not be expected. One sees that the author felt himself greatly cramped. The passages predicting restoration in Amos were rejected as not authentic; in Hosea they were accepted as being entirely consistent with the trend of the author's thought; in Micah they are accepted (with Wildeboer, Ryssel, de Goeje), as against Cheyne. Chaps. 1–3 are assigned to a date between 725 and 718 B.C. Chap. 4 : 1–5, the prophecy of the mountain of the Lord's house (also in Isa. 2 : 2–5), is correctly regarded as pre-exilic, indeed, as belonging to the eighth or beginning of the seventh century. This is the position taken for 4 : 6—5 : 14. Chap. 7 : 7–20 is thought to contain several pieces of various dates. On the ground of the restoration of the people only to Bashan and Gilead, the provinces overrun by Tiglath-pileser III in 734, the larger part is taken as early; vs. 11, from the exile, vss. 18–20 standing separately.

It could be devoutly wished that every pastor who is capable of appreciating a piece of work like this series of sermonic discourses would study them as a model of expository preaching. The applications to the preacher's situation are most apt and of overwhelming force. It is not every audience perhaps that could be held to sermons of such strength and character; but, after all, the simplicity and sincerity which are everywhere so marked would go far to make them as attractive as they are profitable. We join with the author in his defense against those who regard the application of ancient prophecy to the problems of our day as the prostitution of prophecy. The

prophets were practical men and "spoke for a practical purpose." This book will open up to many what has always been for them an unknown land. WILLIAM R. HARPER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

HANDBUCH DER ALTTESTAMENTLICHEN THEOLOGIE. Von AUGUST DILLMANN. Aus dem Nachlass des Verfassers herausgegeben von RUDOLPH KITTEL. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1895. Pp. viii + 565. M. 11.

THE preface states that the editor has carefully selected from material left by the author such parts and proportions as he believed to represent the most mature thought of the author. Also the work has been so edited as not to leave the reader in uncertainty in respect to what has come from the author and what from the editor.

The body of the work after a general introduction to the study of Old Testament theology consists of three parts: I. Preliminary discussion of the nature of the Old Testament religion; II. Historical representation of the development of the religion; III. Doctrinal exposition, followed by twenty pages of index. In general the volume bulks not far from two-thirds as much as the fourth edition of Schultz's *Old Testament Theology*, which has been translated into English.

The conception of Old Testament theology, presented in this volume, is that of an essential constituent of biblical theology, closely bound to the theology of the New Testament, inasmuch as it presents the development of the redemptive religion in the stages preparatory to the New Testament revelation; while the ultimate aim and uses of this discipline are subsidiary to the proof of the inner truth of Christianity, of the necessity of the Old Testament revelation and its conformity to God's purpose of redemption.

The preliminary discussion of the nature and character of the religion of the Old Testament denies at once that the fundamental thought of this religion was either monotheism or sublimity, for neither of these accounts for the ethical character of the religion of Israel, and this character essentially differentiates it from all heathen religions. The real basis is found in the holiness of God, from which follow the conceptions of monotheism, the creation of the world, and freedom from any moral evil. It also necessitates a deeply ethical view of the physical world and of history, so that the relation between God and man is thoroughly ethical and therefore it is progressive,